NORTH-WESTERN
CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

HE THAT DOETH TRUTH COMETH TO THE LIGHT, THAT HIS DEEDS MAY BE MADE MANIFEST, THAT THEY ARE OF GOD.—*Messiah.*

VOL. III. CINCINNATI, FEBRUARY, 1857. No. 8.

Paul's Letter to Philemon.

In the "Millennial Harbinger" for December we find from the pen of Bro. A. Campbell an article under the caption: "Our Anniversaries in Cincinnati," from which we make the following extract:

"I am not sure that Elder Boggs was a member of the convention.—He was, however, in attendance. I have much esteem for him as a brother of good and honorable intentions. I am, indeed, not gratified with his "One Ideaism" as depicted in his *North-Western Christian Magazine*, devoted mainly, as I learn, to pure 'abolitionism.'—I read a few articles in it on its first appearance; and laid it on my table, having as full a knowledge of his position, as I could ever acquire. While dining with him during the convention at his residence, he was so courteous as not to moot the subject, which I regarded as quite a compliment, and for which I feel grateful to him. He has not carefully considered Paul's letter to Philemon, which I commend to his special and prayerful attention. I am very sure he could not write such a letter to a christian master touching a runaway slave, as did Paul to Philemon touching his *doulos* (slave) Onesimus, whom Paul sent home with a letter to his master. In passing I commend to him a very close analysis of Paul to Philemon—and when matured in his conceptions of that epistle, if he can justify his own position, I must say that I have formed an inadequate idea of his perspicacity."

We sincerely thank the writer for his kind regards to us, as expressed in the foregoing paragraph. We assure him we can fully appreciate the blessedness of enjoying the "esteem" of those who deservedly rank high among the wise and good of earth's denizens.

We think, however, that his article is so worded as possibly to mislead some of his very numerous readers in reference to our position, and our humble efforts to assuage the woes and dry the tears of a sin-cursed world. He speaks of our "one-ideaism" as depicted in the N.-W. Chr. Magazine, devoted mainly, as I learn, to pure abolitionism. It strikes us that the term "one ideaism," when applied to a Magazine, whose avowed objects are *fourfold*, and instead of being "mainly devoted to pure abolitionism," advocates not only "universal liberty by opposition to American slavery, *espe-*

cially as connected with the church of Christ," but also with equal clearness and voluminousness, "the promotion of the great *temperance reform;* the advancement of *general education*, and the advocacy of *primitive christianity* as taught by christ and his apostles," is as inappropriate as it was when applied by the sectarian world to the "Christian Baptist," in reference to the subject of *baptism!* Those best acquainted with that inimitable work, have long since become satisfied that the "one-ideaism" on the subject of Baptism was not in Bro. Campbell's writings, but in the *minds* of those of his readers who felt it their interest to *find* it there.

It is true, we have given the subject of slavery some prominence, believing with Bro. Campbell, that it is the "maximum of all evils," and believing with his "Christian Baptist," that "if any thing is wanting to finish a picture of the most glaring inconsistencies," it is "those christians who are daily extolling the blessings of civil liberty, and at the same time, *by a system of the most cruel oppression*, separating the wife from the embraces of her husband, and the mother from her tender offspring; violating every principle, and rending every tie, that endears life and reconciles man to his lot; and that, forsooth, because '*might gives right*,' and man is held guilty because his skin is a shade darker than the standard color of the times." Still we have not given it greater conspicuity than some other subjects—nor more, than he gave the subject of baptism in his early writings, and we certainly should consider any one as wide of the mark who would accuse him of "one ideaism" even on that subject.

We have ascertained that Bro. Campbell's language in reference to the subject of slavery not having been mooted by us, during a short visit with which he favored us, has been entirely misunderstood by a portion at least of his very numerous readers. They have received the idea that the subject was not introduced by any person, nor in any wise spoken of, in his presence during that interview. But he certainly did not *design* to convey such an idea inasmuch as the subject *was* introduced by one of our guests, and spoken of both by Bro. Campbell and ourself. He will no doubt recollect saying that "the blighting effects of slavery could be seen on the very *fence corners* in Virginia;" and that when he accused us of "ultraism," we plead *not guilty*, on the ground that ultraists hated *slaveholders*, but that while we hated *slavery*, we *loved* slaveholders, and were laboring to reclaim them from the error of their ways. Indeed, we received the impression from Brother Campbell's remarks on that occasion, as we had done on former ones at his own house, that he looked upon slavery just about in the same light that we do; that he had no sympathy with oppression of any kind, and that he did not consider American slavery as analogous to the servitude recognized in the Old Testament. We discovered that to his mind there was a kind of mad-dog-terrorism in the word "*abolitionist*," but we felt assured that the strength of his intellect, and the goodness of his heart would at some time be sufficient to disabuse his mind in reference to that harmless, but much-abused word.

The language of Bro. Campbell, in reference to Paul's letter to Philemon is also, we think, liable to be misunderstood. It has already been quoted by some as an evidence that he favored the institution of slavery, and considered the case of Onesimus as parallel to that of a fugitive from Southern slavery fleeing from the cruelties of a besotted and brutal overseer, trembling with fear, and panting for that land where "the servant is freed from his master," and the "chattel personal" becomes a *man*, in the possession of his natural and inalienable rights. We have too high an opinion of Bro. Campbell's *head* and *heart* to suppose he meant to convey any such idea. It would not only conflict with the whole theory and practice of his life on that subject, but form a direct issue with the facts in the case.

To make the case of Onesimus and Philemon sustain American slavery, or that most unchristian and iniquitous law known as the "Fugitive Slave Bill," several things would have to be assumed that cannot be proven, and others taken for granted which did not exist. ***First***, it must be clearly shown that ***Onesimus*** was a slave in the American acceptation of that term. Every one must see the absolute necessity of this as a very *first step* towards making out the case. The only shadow of evidence which the *apologists* of slavery adduce, is the Greek word "*doulos*," which they assert *always* means "slave." We feel confident, however, that Bro. Campbell never did, and never will, make any such an assertion. He is well aware that the term "*doulos*" was by those who spoke the Greek language used in quite as general and latitudinarian a sense as the word "*servant*" is used at the present time by the citizens of this country. According to Greenfield, the term "*doulos*" occurs in the New Testament *one hundred and twenty two times*. It is applied *twenty eight* times to the servants of God and Christ; ***Once*** to Christ *as* the servant of God; ***Four*** times to the servants of sin and Satan; *Once* to those under the elements of the world, and in the 16th verse of the 6th chap. of Paul's letter to the Romans it is used *indefinitely*. It is applied *sixty eight* times to servants of men; of Jewish master *forty-seven* times; of masters generally without distinction *eighteen* times; of a Gentile master *once*, and to christians as servants of each other *twice*.

It is also well known to all Greek scholars, and especially to Bro. Campbell, (who is acknowledged to be the very prince of linguists), that that language enabled those who spoke and wrote it to make the nicest shades of distinction in reference to the subject, and to discriminate accurately between various kinds of servitude. The word "*douleuo*" was used to denote service in general, without reference to the origin of the obligation to serve. Domestic, or household servants, however they might have become such, were designated by the word "*oiketeuo*". Service, as of soldiers, for pay, was known by the term "*latreuo*." To serve as a hired person for pay was denoted by "*misthoo*." To serve as a waiter, especially as an attendant at the door, was expressed by the term "*hypakouo*." The most specific word to denote a chattel personal, or that property in man claimed by the slaveholder towards his slave, aside from the relations and offices in which he was employed, was not "*doulos*," but "*andrapodon*." The Greeks, therefore, used the term "*doulos*" to express servitude in its most general or latitudinarian sense, whatever might have been the origin of the service rendered. There can be no doubt that the term "*doulos*" might mean slave, and that it was generally so applied by the classic writers, and we are free to admit that it is frequently so used in the New Testament; but the fact of its being used does not of *necessity* denote the relation sustained by the person to whom it is applied; nor is it safe to *infer* from that circumstance, that such person was held as property, or had been bought with the money of the person to whom he was said to owe service. There is, therefore, no scriptural evidence that Onesimus was the property of Philemon, or in the American sense of the term, a slave. *Secondly*, the apologist of slavery must show that Paul sent Onesimus back to Philemon, *in the capacity of a slave*. The simple fact of his going back to Philemon, after he had been converted by the preaching of the apostle Paul, or his sending a letter by him to Philemon, is not a sufficient warrant to justify a christian preacher in arresting a "runaway slave," when striving to obtain that same liberty which he himself would only surrender with his life, and sending him back even to a (so called) "christian master," who in all probability would cause him to be whipped to the last extremity, and then sold as a beast of burden away from all the associations and endearments which hitherto had combined to render his situation less intolerable than it otherwise would have been. After an examination of the context, we have been unable to find the least shadow of proof on this point. On the contrary, however, we find it stated by Paul, that he was to be received by Philemon, "not as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved."

In the third place, the apologist of American slavery must show, that the return of Onesimus was *involuntary*. If for the sake of the argument we should admit, (what never can be proven,) that he was a slave in the American meaning of that term, and that Paul sent him back, *as such*, to his master; still, unless it can be shown that he went back contrary to his own will, and using all the while his faculties of mind and body to resist the mandate of the good old apostle, the case fails to be made out. It might bear some resemblance to the case of those unhappy persons about whom the pro-slavery religionists of our day make so much ado, who drawn by the natural attachment of kindred, or so degraded by slavery as not to be able to appreciate freedom, have returned *voluntarily* to their chains and degradation; but it has no analogy whatever to a fugitive slave case, unless it can be shown that his return was involuntary, and the result of coercion on the part of the apostle.

Our readers will discover from the foregoing remarks, that the whole argument, (so called,) in favor of slavery and the fugitive slave law, is based upon an *assumption*. There is no *positive* or certain evidence in the letter, that Onesimus was a slave at all. The context does not necessarily demand such a supposition, or such an interpretation of the Greek word "*doulos*." On the contrary, the whole circumstances: the language of the apostle, the context, and the *spirit* of that religion professed by all the parties mentioned, would lead to a different conclusion. While there are several things either expressed or implied in the letter, which are wholly irreconcilable with the supposition that Onesimus was a fugitive slave, and that Paul sent him back *as such* to the slave-holder Philemon, while every expression contained in the whole letter will harmonize perfectly with the supposition that Philemon did *not* hold property in Onesimus, but that the relation which existed between them was that of a limited and voluntary servitude.

Onesimus may have been bound to service until he was of age, by his parents or guardian, or he may have voluntarily obligated himself to serve for wages, and in either case the whole of the letter will apply with perfect ease. But when the apologists for American slavery undertake to prove by it that slavery is right, and that it is the duty of christians to return the fugitive slave to his master, they have not only to assume the very thing that it is important for them to prove, namely that Onesimus was a "chattel-personal," but they also have to encounter difficulties which are absolutely unsurmountable. For example, how supremely ridiculous is the idea that the apostle Paul, endeavoring to carry out the spirit of the fugitive slave law, and establish a precedent for christians in all coming time, should sit down and write a letter to the master Philemon, and send it by the slave Onesimus, without the slightest means of compelling him to go to Collosse, or any where else. How many "runaway slaves" could even Bro. Campbell compel to return to Alabama or Mississippi by simply writing a letter to the "christian masters" with whom he happened to be acquainted, and sending it by the hands of the slaves without any adequate force to compel them to return? And yet, this is precisely the position in which the apologists of slavery place the apostle Paul. He had no *power* to send Onesimus back to his master, unless he *chose* to go. He had no civil authority to appeal to. He had no "United States marshal" to provide a guard to send him with. He had no sheriffs to convey him from place to place, or confine him in the jails to prevent his escape. Indeed, he had not the slightest means of controlling him, or in any wise compelling him to return to Collosse, to assume again the degrading labors of a slave. He could have *told* him to go back to Philemon, but that was the utmost extent of his power.

Again, after *assuming* that Onesimus was a slave, and *assuming* that Paul had the power to send him back, and *assuming* that he exercised that power, (for it is all assumption on the part of the slavery apologists,) the difficulty comes up that Paul did not send him back in the same condition in which he had left. If the Greek word "*doulos*' does mean *slave*, the language of Paul conveys the idea that he was not, after his return, to be treated or regarded *as* a slave. "Not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved, especially to me, but how much more unto thee, both in the flesh and in the Lord?" Could Philemon comply with the requisition of Paul, and yet retain Onesimus as his slave, regarding him as a "chattel," as property, as a "*thing?*" By no means. If he had been formerly a slave, than it is expressly declared in the letter, "*not now as a slave.*" If he had been a slave before, Paul did not *wish* that he should be regarded as a *slave* any longer. His language implies, that in regard to the condition in which he had been before, he was *not* to be so any longer. Bro. Campbell is aware that the adverb "*ouketo*" rendered "not now," means *no more*, *no farther*, *no longer*. It clearly implies, that in regard to the condition in which Onesimus had been before, he was not to be so any more. This is the sense in which it is used and rendered in several places in the New Testament. See Matth. xix. 6, xxii. 46, Luke xv. 19, John vi. 66, xi. 54, xiv. 19, xvii. 11; Acts viii. 39; Gal. iv. 7, and Eph. 11, 19, in all of which places the same Greek word is used.

On the suppositisn that Onesimus was a slave, could Philemon have complied with the expressed wish of Paul and yet hold him as his chattel? The very attempt to do so would have been a direct violation of his request. He desired him to receive and treat him in all respects as a christian brother; as one who had been redeemed by the blood of Christ; as a *man*, "not now as a servant, but *above* a servant, *a brother beloved;*" that is as a christian brother. Philemon could not treat him as a "brother beloved," and yet regard him as his slave. Is it treating one in all respects as a christian brother to deprive him of his liberty; to hold him as an article of merchandize; to extort from him his labor without remuneration? Would the man himself, who holds another as his slave, suppose that *he* was treated as a christian brother, if *he* were reduced to that condition? It is *impossible* for any man to regard his slave as in the full and proper sense of the phrase "*a christian brother.*" He may esteem him highly as a christian, and may treat him with kindness; but as long as he regards him as his *property*, his feelings towards him must be different from those entertained towards other christians. The master, if a christian, cannot help feeling that his slave brother, if treated in all respects as a christian, would be as free as himself, and enjoy the same right to his time, talents, and domestic enjoyments. Onesimus was evidently received by Philemon either as *not* a slave, or *not* a "brother beloved;" the two relations are entirely incompatible.

From "a very close analysis" of the whole letter, we have come to the conclusion, that the only way to see in it any justification for slavery, or the Fugitive Slave law, is to look through *pro-slavery* glasses. To the naked eye it certainly is not discernable. There is no conclusive evidence that Onesimus was a slave; none that Paul sent him back; none that he did not go back from choice; and none that he was sent back *as a slave*, even on the hypothesis that he had been one, and that his return to Philemon was not voluntary. If there is not more positive authority for that "Pandora's box," that "deadly upas," that "hydra-headed monster," American slavery, than is to be found in Paul's letter to Philemon, we advise all Bible christians to wash their hands from all participation in it.

In conclusion we beg leave to introduce on the subject an extract from one of Bro. Campbell's own correspondents, who may be presumed to enjoy greater credit for "perspicacity," than we do, in some latitudes where the Harbinger is read. It is from a very able address on the "Design of Civil Governments," by Elder Isaac Errett:

"We come to the case of Onesimus. And here we observe first, it is by no means certain that he was a *slave*. He was a servant of some sort, but that he was a slave, is doubtful. He is spoken of as *owing* Philemon, and Paul asks that the debt should be put to his account. Apart from what was called their *peculium*, Roman slaves could *own* nothing, and *owe* nothing, for all they had was their master's. Paul commends him to Philemon as a "brother beloved both in the flesh and in the Lord." This does not sound much like slavery. It may mean no more than that Philemon and Onesimus were of the same nation, but it *may* mean also, that Onesimus and Philemon were *kindred*. It is quite as likely that under the *Grecian* law he was a freedman; for the term *doulos* here employed to denote his position and character, is that by which freedmen in Greece were distinguished. But, admit him to be Philemon's slave—he is not sent back to be oppressed and crushed in spirit, and ground down by a cruel and heartless master, as must often be the case under this fugitive law. He sends him back with this injunction to Philemon: "Receive him as myself," and expressing this conviction on his own part: "Knowing that thou wilt also do more than I say." Let it be remembered too, that Onesimus *voluntarily returned*, assured that it was better for him so to do. And he returned to Colosse with a high commendation from Paul to the Church. "All my state shall Tychicus declare unto you, who is a beloved brother, and a faithful minister and fellow servant in the Lord: whom I have sent unto you, for the same purpose, that he might know your estate, and comfort your hearts; with Onesimus, a faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you. They shall make known unto you all things that are done here." Col. 4: 7:9. And this is made parallel to the cases of forcible arrest, summary trial, and extradition of fugitives, who return to a state of heathenism, that will, according to the testimonies of slaveholders themselves, compare with any other part of heathendom for ignorance and brutality! If any one still thinks the cases parallel, he had better get a copy of the Fugitive Slave law, and lay it beside the epistle to Philemon, and compare them; then look at Onesimus voluntarily returning in company with Tychicus, "a faithful minister in the Lord," with high testimonials to the church, as "a faithful and beloved brother," and compare him with the broken spirited fugitive, conveyed by the Marshal and his aids back to a slavery that he hates and loathes as worse than death!"

The Bible Vindicated.—No. 9.

"And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort." 1st Tim. 6, 2.

The advocates of slavery place more reliance upon the first four verses of this chapter, than all the New Testament beside. Whatever may be obscure in the sense of the 1st and 2nd verses, must be made plain by the 3d verse. "If any man teach otherwise and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the doctrine which is according to godliness," &c. This is the key. It is to the passage, including the first ten verses, what the key note is in music. It must decide on which side of the question the teachers were, from which Timothy was to "withdraw himself." Teachers, who were teaching on the subject of slavery a doctrine contrary to the doctrine of Christ, were to be the subjects of correction and discipline. This was the specific object of this part of the epistle. Slavery is in the passage *only* by implication. Some teachers were either ignorant or obstinate. They would not consent to the standard authority,—to the teachings of Christ and his apostles. But for these teachers who are complimented by the apostle with being both proud and ignorant, we should not have this item of instruction to Timothy, and through him to the churches: for the occasion which called it forth, would not have existed.

Now to the issue. Did Paul in his instructions to Timothy, as to the course he should pursue with these false teachers, justify slavery, as it then existed in the Roman empire? Here the teachers differ. Some say he did, others say he did not. Whatever he taught in this place, directly or indirectly, upon the practical aspects of the subject, must have been "according to the words of Jesus Christ and the doctrine of godliness." The teachings of those animadverted upon were the per contra. Paul and these teachers were belligerents. Timothy, as the superintendent of the church at Ephesus, was required to proceed against them. He was first to charge *them* to desist from "teaching another doctrine." See 1st Tim. 1, 3. Then, if they still persisted, and would not "consent to the wholesome words of our Lord Jesus Christ and the doctrine which is according to godliness," he was required to *withdraw* from them. These teachers were *heretics*, (*schismatics*) for they were "causing divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which they had learned." "A man, that is a heretic after the first and second admonition, reject." Titus 3–10.

If our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, and his apostles, were *pro-slavery* preachers, these were *anti-slavery* preachers. And, *vise versa:* If Jesus Christ and the apostles were *anti-slavery* preachers, these were *pro-slavery* preachers; for on the subject of slavery these parties taught contrary doctrines.

Pro-slavery pleaders assume, that Christ and his apostles were *pro-slavery* preachers. This is precisely what all errorists have and do assume, whether Papists or Protestants. Universalists claim, that the inspired preachers taught the doctrine of universal salvation; Calvinists claim that they preached the doctrine of unconditional election, and reprobation; Pædo-Baptists that they taught the doctrine of infant sprinkling; and slave-holders, whether such in principle or practice, that they were the staunch advocates of the rightfulness of human slavery. Each, in his own way, appeals to the Bible, for the defense of his own dogma. No doctrine or practice in professed christendom, however *monstrous* and *absurd*, but has looked to the Bible for justification. But all these, and other errorists, look to other sources for instruction. Universalists get their instruction from A. Winchester, H. Ballou, and some lesser lights; and then go to the Bible for the defence of that they never learned from its pages. Calvinists study Calvin's Institutes, and listen to some of his retailers for instruction in doctrine, and then appeal to the Word of Inspiration for defence of what they learned in other books,—were taught by teachers *sent not* by God, but by men. Pro-slavery teachers, in the primitive church, took their lessons from the Roman Slave Code, based upon the anti-christian *axiom*, that "*might* gives *right*:" and then sought to incorporate this cruel, bloody doctrine with the "Gospel of Peace," and universal "good will among men." In this they followed the judaizers and philosophers who, to some extent, succeeded in blending their corruptions with the "pure" and "holy" gospel of Christ. But the apostles, endued with a divine vigilance, descried these corrupters and warned the evangelists and elders against their innovations. Hence our text and its parallels: "If any man consent not to wholesome words," &c.

The pro-slavery teachers, with whom we are concerned, have received their instructions from *kidnappers*,—from manstealers; from the national and state constitutions; local slave laws; fugitive slave bills; the decision of courts, and a corrupt public sentiment; and to these we may add the self-contradictory and suicidal teachings of some apologizing scribes, who say they are opposed to slavery and in the same paragraph say, that "both Moses and Paul,—Old and New Testaments,—admit and sustain the relation of bond-servant and bond-master for life." From these sources they receive their instructions, and then go to the Bible for justification. They have made at least a show of defence; so have the advocates of popery and of prelacy. Can they make a better effort in defence of slavery by an appeal to the Bible, than baby sprinklers?

Many of the good, the pious, and the learned, practise infant baptism, and honestly believe it to be the baptism ordained by Jesus Christ and practised by the apostles. Thousands have of late years been convinced that it was a mere show of defence; by twisting and bending the Scriptures to support a convenient, a favorite, a popular proselyting dogma. Begotten and born outside the Bible, and then brought to the Bible for confirmation, to be christened *Christian Baptism.*

There is no system of ecclesiastical or civil corruption and tyranny, that has not, by false issues and interpretations, claimed Bible justification and defence. In divers times and places, the divine right of kings is defended with as much argument and logic, as American slavery was or ever can be. There is no book on earth more liable to such "*wrestings*," than the Bible. This was extensively done in the days of the apostles; to which one of them is witness. "Wrest," the Epistles of Paul, "as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction." 2d Pet. 3, 16.

This liability to be wrested is unavoidable from its variety of subject and brevity in detail. Still, there is a spirit of purity, of righteousness, of benevolence, underlying the whole, which will ever be a safeguard to the "single-hearted."

The Bible will defend its own begotten children. It does this freely, voluntarily. It does this to the satisfaction of children, and the clearest apprehension of the upright in heart, to all who have no selfish object to subserve, when they open its inspired pages. But illegitimates it will not defend; though often forced upon it for support, it will not receive them. Though importuned by adulterous and interested fathers, it will reject them. It will, with the firmness of God, say they are not mine. It has always said, it now says: "the Papacy is not one of my children. Though she has promised the Bible great numbers and emoluments, but *the* Book says, she is a whore in scarlet attire, and I will expose her; I will put her to shame."

All questions, which have to be forced upon the Bible, are foreign and extraneous subjects. When the subject requires much learning, much talent, and much special pleading, to gain for it Bible support, you may set it down as a settled fact that it is not a Bible subject.

It requires no special pleading, no tact in controversy to shew, that the Gospel is the devoted friend of freedom. A controversy on this subject would be something new. Its motto is: "*Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will among men.*" All men and all nations are equally involved in sin; equally embraced in the plan of redemption; equally honored with a tender of the gospel; equally eligible to honor and promotion in the kingdom of heaven. There are no preferences originating in a "respect of persons;" God's love for all, claiming a corresponding love to all, from all its subjects. In brief, that peace and good will among men is the all pervading spirit of the gospel. This spirit is underlying the work of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; and all the labors, sufferings, and teachings of the apostles and evangelists of Jesus Christ.

The advocates of slavery must take one of three positions: 1st, Either that this is not true of the gospel; or 2d, that slavery is in harmony with this; or third, that this is true of the gospel, with a small exception, namely a few specific passages in the Epistles of Paul and Peter touching slavery.

They will not take the 1st; for then all men would call them infidels. They will not take the 2d, for then all men would laugh at their folly. They will then take the 3d. Let us now see how this will affect the Gospel as a consistent system, claiming a divine origin. The Gospel then teaches both "good will" and ill will "among men;" (for even slave-holders will not say that slavery originated in good will to the enslaved.) It teaches both freedom and slavery. The man that is not blinded by interest or prejudice, would stop and think before he would give to the glorious gospel of Christ such a mixed character, and involve its benignant author in such gross inconsistency.

It would be modest upon the part of these teachers to admit at least the possibility that they had mistaken the true meaning of some five or six short passages in the Epistles, rather than to make a mere fractional part conflict with the balance of the inspired volume. Inasmuch as they have gotten the origin of the system, and all the barbarous regulations by which the system is kept up, outside the Bible, and only ask the Bible to canonize it, such admission on their part would be quite *graceful*. We ask this for their sake, not for the sake of the controversy; for to us it appears a little too coercive to require *Heaven* to father, and the *Church* to nurse the child begotten by the Devil (pirates) and born by their accomplices (purchasers).

Some of the passages here alluded to, pressed into pro-slavery service, we have examined in former articles; but we shall look at them again, from another stand-point. If the teachers, from which Paul commanded Timothy to "*withdraw*" himself, preached anti-slavery doctrine, then Paul preached pro-slavery, and *vice versa.* Paul does not say affirmatively what they did teach on the subject of slavery, but negatively, that they would not "consent" to the "words" of Christ and the "doctrine" of "godliness;" and affirmatively, the effect of their teaching, namely that their preachings led "to envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness; from such withdraw thyself."

Might we not, without further investigation and fear of contradiction, claim that these teachers, now under the *ban* of excommunication, were the advocates of slavery, *outright human slavery*. "By their fruits you shall know teachers, though the wolf should seek to disguise himself under the fleece of a lamb."

The advocacy of freedom, of equal rights, of human rights, of love to all mankind, never produced the bitter fruits here enumerated. But on the contrary, such are, and such ever have been, the legitimate fruits of slavery in the slaveholder's family; in the slave or negro quarters; in the field, in the church, in the state; and such must of necessity be the consequences of the system.

"Supposing that gain is godliness." Can this apply to the man who advocates the principles of universal freedom? Did those benevolent men, who advocated the abolition of West India slavery, do so for the sake of gain? What pecuniary advantage did they expect to reap as a reward for their toil? What selfish object has aroused so many in our own country to plead the cause of the oppressed? You may set aside all who have made it an infidel or political hobby, and then you have the true anti-slavery stamina left, who are preaching and praying for the abolition of American slavery, without the promise or hope of worldly "gain." Nay, the opposite is true in their case. "Supposing that gain is godliness" will not apply to anti-slavery pleaders. "From such withdraw thyself" could not have been from anti-slavery teachers. But is it not probable that it will apply to pro-slavery teachers? Slaveholders are the rich. To secure the favor of the rich is no mean item of gain. The rich are the honorable, the popular and the influential. To "gain" influence and power, is only to "gain" the favor of slave-holders. But again, to be a consistent slave-holder, and to enjoy all the gain arising from the system, a man must advocate the rightfulness of one man laboring, and another being the exclusive receiver of the benefit. And this is not all: he must also maintain, that it is just and right for one man to own another man; to own this other man's wife, and his children, in the same sense that he owns the horses in his stable, or the cooking utensils in his kitchen. Any system, profession, or business that creates wealth, gives ease, power, or influence, is "gain." Slavery proposes all these objects of human desire and pursuit to the masters, but places them out of the reach of the slave, and that *forever;* but universal freedom proposes the equal distribution of these lawful objects of human industry and ambition, and upon an equal basis places them within the reach of all.

Therefore, those who plead the cause of emancipation from principle, influenced by no mixed motives, are beyond the reach of honorable suspicion—that they are actuated by objects of worldly "gain." Nay, the history of the past is a sufficient apology for the purity and disinterestedness of their motives. They have without exception lost *place*, *caste*, and *favor* with those in power: have been mobbed, tarred, and feathered, whipped, imprisoned, lynched, and murdered; have been denounced as disturbers of the peace, agitators, fanatics, and men of one "idea;" a modernism for *fool*. Who but an insane man would espouse and advocate such a cause with the hope of "gain?" But the other side of the question is full of hope, full of promise, especially so long as the slave power is moving all the wheels of society, in every department, as it always has in these United States, and did in the Roman empire, until the Christian religion, by its godlike, benevolent spirit, in its youthful days wrought out for it a most signal reverse.

"Supposing that gain is godliness." "Gain" in an ill sense, as the connection shows, was a feature in those teachers who would not "consent to the wholesome (healing) words of our Lord

Jesus Christ." But there are yet other specifications in relation to those "teachers." "But they that will be rich," verse 9. This has a specific application in this connection. It is by every correct rule of interpretation applicable to those in the 5th verse, who supposed that "gain" was "godliness," and those in the 10th verse who had "erred from the faith;" the same who in the 3d verse taught "otherwise" on the then controverted question of slavery, than "the faith," or the gospel, and would "not consent to the wholesome words of Christ and the doctrine of godliness." In the 5th verse the apostle said to Timothy, "from such (teachers) withdraw thyself." Verse 11 changes the subject, and Timothy himself is the subject of address. "But thou, O man of God, flee these things;" the things taught by the teachers. Flee both the men and "the things." On whatever side of the question these teachers were, this is their *advertisement.*

1st, They would "not consent to the wholesome words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the doctrine which is according to godliness."

2d, They supposed that "gain" was "godliness."

3d, They had "erred from the faith."

And 4th, The tendency of their teaching was "envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings," &c.

With this descriptive notice before us, we conclude that these teachers were on the affirmative of the question and Paul on the negative, unless the 2d verse should lead to a different conclusion. "And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren, but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved partakers of the benefit."

But for the designations "master" and "servant" no one would even suspect that the parties here referred to were master and slave. There is not a word here that looks like oppression. In the 1st verse, where the allusion is to unbelieving masters, it is quite otherwise. There we have the "yoke," "servants under the yoke." The word yoke here means slavery, and metaphorically oppression. A deprivation of rights is essential to slavery. Without this there is no slavery. As soon as a Roman master and his slave were *converted*, they stood in a new relation to each other: "*they are brethren.*" The duties of this new relation must so change and neutralize the prerogatives of the master over the slave, that the designation "*master*" can no longer be applied in its Roman or American sense.

"And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them." Suppose now the master continues to hold his slave, now a "brother," as he did when an unconverted heathen, can the servant obey this command? He cannot help but "despise" him, the command to the contrary notwithstanding. God never made a man *mean* enough to honor such a master. But the master is his brother, therefore he must not despise him. For this reason he must despise him the more, if his master still holds him as a chattel, subject to the same legal and commercial vicissitudes as before their conversion. It would be a christian *virtue* to *despise* such a master; for what a man can approve in another, he can justify in himself.

The enlightened christian slave, that could justify his professed christian master to continue the same course towards him as before their conversion, could justify himself in slave-holding, if he possessed the power.

A brother can only esteem a brother if he acts a brother's part. If not, the disesteem is in the proportion that one christian brother has a right to expect from another. Therefore, Paul did not command the servant *not* to despise his master because he was his master, but because he was his *brother*. It is worthy of remark here, that in all the instructions to servants there is not one duty enjoined upon them towards their masters because they are their masters. The duty to respect, to honor, or to obey, is always drawn from some other consideration. We shall give a few examples.

1st. "Servants be obedient to them that are your masters," &c., "in singleness of your heart as unto Christ." "Not with eye service as men pleasers, but as the servants of Christ doing the will of God from the heart. With good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men." Eph. 6.

2d. "Servants obey," &c., "not with eye service as men pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing God. And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as unto the Lord and not unto men," &c., "for ye serve the Lord Christ." Col. 3.

3d. "That they may adorn the doctrine of God our Savior in all things." Titus 2: 10.

4th. "Servants, be subject to your masters," &c., "for this is thank worthy if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully." 1st Pet. 2–18–19.

5th. Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor." (Why?) "That the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed." "And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them." (Why not?) "Because they are brethren."

These examples fully prove the position that the apostles could find no motive to respect or obedience in the relation of master, or they would have enforced it. In other relations they found the motive to duty in the relation, and not in some remote consideration. To this we shall also cite a few examples: "Husbands love your wives." "The wife see that she reverence her husband." "Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right." "Fathers, provoke not your children to wrath." "Love as brethren." "Honor all men. "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates." "Submit yourself to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him." 1st Pet. 2: 13–14. "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God," &c. "Render therefore to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor."

In all these cases the duty to love, reverence, honor, obey, &c., grows out of the immediate relation, as things legitimate. But the relation of master is not even the proximate cause claiming obedience or honor from the servant. Here then is a marked difference between the slave relation and the other relations. This fact has placed a dark seal of reprobation upon this relation. The relation is recognized, but *not* respected. Its existence is admitted but *not* sustained. It is the subject of special legislation, but no duty is based upon it. Is the christian servant to honor his heathen master, *it is for the sake of the name of God and his word.* Is the believing servant to respect his believing master, *it is because they are brethren.* Let them not despise them because they are master and servant—*nay*, but because they are brethren. The old relation is named, but the duty to respect is based upon the new relation "because they are brethren." "But rather do them service because they are faithful." "Faithful" as heathen masters? *Nay*, "faithful as brethren;" brethren in Christ, beloved by the servant, because the master is a "faithful" brother in the Lord—"partakers of the benefit." "*Parteneres of the benefice.*" (Tindal's translation.)

Neither of these readings will apply to slavery. There is no appreciable sense, in which the master and the slave can be said to be partakers in anything touching the product of the slave's labor. It will not do to say that the slave lived upon the product of his own labor. This might be affirmed of a horse or a mule, in the same sense; for neither live for themselves. Their lives are valuable to another. Are they well fed and strong, it is to the interest of the owner, as physical debility would be no loss to them. The masters were partakers of the benefit. They were sharers or partners with their servants. The idea conveyed is mutual interest, a thing irreconcilable with slavery, but most reconcilable with christian brotherhood. But for the *noun* (master) the reader would not suspect that this passage had even the remotest allusion to slaves, as it is more descriptive of another relation, namely that of *Lord* and *Tenant*. The tenant is a mere occupant of that which belongs to another; therefore he is the dependent, and may with great propriety be exhorted not to despise his more affluent brother, though more fortunate in worldly circumstances; he is nevertheless faithful to his poorer brother, and should be beloved by him. In this relation there is a reciprocity of interest corresponding to the text—"partakers" (parteneres) "of the benefit;" language wholly irreconcilable with slavery. And to urge this upon a slave as a motive to fidelity would be to add insult to insult.

Whatever Paul and Peter *did* mean by the designations "master" and "servant," when writing to christians, they *did* not use them in their current political import. In the state, the right of ownership, and therefore the duty to serve, are based directly upon the relation; in the New Testament *never*. The duties enjoined are subversive of the relation, because in harmony with the law of brotherly love. The titles Master and Servant, in their political value, cannot be reconciled with christian relations, rights, and duties. Here is an impassable gulf. But it may be asked, why use them? It may not be so easy to give a satisfactory answer to this question. Still the fact cannot be denied, that in the apostolic writings they do not express the rights and responsibilities they do so clearly express in slave codes, whether ancient or modern. If there is a difficulty here, the slave-holder has the harder side. Hard as it may be to reconcile the titles in their state import, with the duties as specified by Paul and Peter, he is nevertheless obliged to do it or give up his claim to the New Testament writers as pro-slavery preachers. But should we fail to solve this difficulty, we fail on mercy's side. But to the task:

1st. The parties were properly described by these titles before they were converted to christianity.

2d. They were still master and servant when converted.

3d. Whatever changes in this relation and duties to each other, were subsequent to their conversion to Jesus Christ.

4th. The change was not an instantaneous, but a gradual work effected by the leavening process of the Gospel, as suggested to the parties by new and holy relations, new duties growing out of divine relations, and enforced by new motives—motives quickened into action by a new spirit, the spirit of God: therefore the same titles were appropriately applied to those in this relation, subsequent to their embracing the Gospel, and no abuse of language, or of principle, to continue the old titles so long as the parties continued together, though their relative position was so materially changed, as to be partakers in what they jointly produced by the capital of the one and the labor of the other.

This was giving to the servant what was just and equal. This was consenting to the "wholesome words of our Lord Jesus Christ." This was saying with him that "*the laborer is worthy of his hire.*" This, too, was "according to the doctrine of godliness;" namely "*that no man go beyond and defraud his brother in any matter.*" To require for servants what was "just and equal," could not fail to be offensive to those teachers who were opposed to Christ and his apostles. They supposed that "gain" was "godliness," and slavery was "gain." To give servants what was "just and equal," to let them be "partakers" with their masters in the "benefit," was destroying the "gain" of the business. These teachers had long enjoyed the "gain" of oppression, and they were unwilling to give it up. Therefore Paul said: "Timothy, do you 'withdraw' from them."

The 2d verse teaches nothing peculiar, nothing different from the general instructions given to all Christians:

1st, That christian brethren should not despise one another.

2d, That they should be faithful to one another.

3d, That they should love one another.

4th, That they should be partakers in whatever benefit might result from capital invested or labor performed. This is Paul's instruction to christian masters and servants. These obstructions obeyed, must put an end to slavery and every form of unrighteous "gain."

We shall in our next look at the subject from a pro-slavery stand point, with some remarks on Philemon.

JONAS HARTZEL.
Davenport, Iowa.

The Profit of Afflictions.

This is a hard way, but God often appoints it as the best way. It is hard to suffer, but a blessed advantage may come from it. That utterance of an ancient disciple, has met with a full response in the experience of all who have come after: "It is good for me that I have been afflicted, that I might learn thy statutes." Afflictions have an instructive efficacy. Indeed, the most common figure under which they are spoken of, is that of a school. God, then, is the schoolmaster, and so we come under a divine tutelage.

In this school, the Bible becomes a chief book. We are drawn to it as we are not at other times; no book like God's to the filial heart when it is filled with sorrow. Then the heart is open and eager to receive. Then Providence interprets, and the precious meaning heaves up and flows out; and the promises unlock and discharge something of their ocean-fullness, until the peace of that soul, bowed down on this rugged bank, becomes as a river, and its righteousness as the waves of the sea.

In this school, we come to understand our frailty; how slight our hold on life, and the life of those dear to us. Here too comes home the lesson of sinfulness: we learn the evil of sin, as we taste the bitter fruits of it in pain, sickness, decay, death—all the work of sin. The soul's worth, the greatness of its interests, the importance that the mighty treasure be made eternally safe, is another of the lessons which comes home to the heart in this school. At such a time, is there any thing to compare with the soul? Is it not the vastest thing that has being and a dwelling here below? We are taught so as to feel the greatness and the weight of responsibility in regard to it—the value, the unprized preciousness of the opportunities to guide and save it. By the side of this greatness pertaining to the soul, the world falls back into its proper littleness, taking in this school, as it ought, the lowest bench. We are taught to look away from the world; to regard eternity; to realize it as near —a step, and we are there. We are taught, and can no more doubt it, that substance is there; the best friends are there; joy in its infinitude there. And there the treasure must be, or we have no treasure; if no home there, miserably homeless, eternal exiles, outcast wanderers, and the blackness of darkness for ever.

Affliction is God's school—he putting us there to learn; himself there to teach. Of course, he comes, at such a time, very near to us; we feel his hand touching us; we get, as it were, a look at the very heart of God. We gain a perception of his ways, and a clearer knowledge of all his attributes. And where we feared most, we find deliverance. What we had read or heard, we find true in fact, that wisdom and goodness mark all his proceedings.

Another department of the profit from affliction lies in their subduing and corrective efficacy. And this comes in part from the peculiar force of the teachings. The truth now, is not a matter said, but done. The doctrine and the example are wrought together and come with combined strength, not to the intellect only, but to the conscience and the sensibilities. The things of God we now set down as great, because we have begun to experience them. God has entered, and with his own hand lodged them within; and they are deeply and undoubtedly demonstrated; and there to abide and work out their legitimate results. Afflictions profit, not by a direct action, but only through the truth. Through this medium, what do they? What are the graces they peculiarly foster and strengthen? We answer: There is more faith in God after the painful process; simply because we have had a near experience of God. We have been taken into his hand, and he has dealt with us; has removed, perhaps, some cherished possession; has greatly altered our circumstances. Now, when this close, intimate work of God is done, if there is any faith in Him, there will be an increase of faith, because that whole proceeding and issue, so far as it unfolds, is all so admirable, so worthy of God. If there is any thing dark, submission is exercised; and thus the afflicted Christian, in this school of trials, grows to be a submissive Christian; so that when greater trials come, and even the greatest, the grace of submission is so ascendant, that there is but one sentiment, and that fills the heart—"not my will but thine be done."

A kindred quality in the character is patience. This, too gathers vigor and perpetuity; not, as before, soon fainting, but coming quietly to bear all that God may impose; deeming the burden not heavy, because laid on by the Divine hand; privileged and pleased even to serve God by suffering, and to honor his grace by showing to the world the patience of the saints. The spirituality of the mind is also advanced; its interest in spiritual things, its sensibility to spiritual motives, and in the same proportion, the happiness of the spirit, grows. As affliction brings the heart more in sympathy with God and heaven, it gives to it a greater, deeper, purer joy. There is sorrow; there are tears; perhaps regrets. But there is a sweetness in the very sorrow, and a pearly treasure to the tears. The happiness of prayer, at such a time, is peculiar. The world is out of the way; there is a very near access; a deep feeling of need; a full flowing out of desire; a felt preciousness in the promise; the commingling of a divine fellowship. One hour thus spent, outweighs, in the scale of true enjoyment, a life of gay and brilliant fluttering.—*Exchange.*

A Help to Tender Consciences.

A great stumbling-block to some of our pious friends is the idea that Slavery is a Biblical Institution. It may furnish them some relief to remember, that the underground railroad is also a Biblical Institution, and one which received the express sanction of the Almighty. The attempt to check its operation met with the most terrible rebuke on record. See the account of *Pharaoh and his effort to enforce the fugitive slave law.*—Exod. 5th chap. on through the 14th.

Wayside Sketches, No. 4.

From the broad prairies of Tippecanoe County, where for miles a forest tree is not seen, the traveler bound eastward, is soon carried to the dense forests of Boone. In a ride of a few miles the contrast could not well be greater. The arm of the Grand Prairie on the west of Lafayette, the Wild Cat on the east, and the Shawnee on the south, present to the eye an unbroken expanse of finely undulating farm land, while the Wehaw plains are an almost uninterrupted corn field of many thousand acres. It was with regret we learned that a very large proportion of the corn annually grown upon its fertile soil, was consumed by the distilleries in the vicinity.

The first point of much importance is Thorntown, which we consider rather a pretty village of some five or six hundred inhabitants. We have there a small congregation who own a meeting house, and have the elements among themselves not only to perpetuate their existence, but also to exert a salutary influence on the community around. Bro. John Otterman, well known in that part of Indiana as an efficient evangelist, has his membership there, but is laboring the most of his time at other points in the county. The county seat is Lebanon, and although destitute of the cedars which adorned its ancient namesake, it is not wanting in trees of huge dimensions.

We could not but wish while enjoying the luxury of the blazing wood fires so lavishly piled together at the hearth stone of almost every domicil we visited, that a portion of the surplus fuel there rotting in the woods, could be transported to Cincinnati, and other cities where the poor and friendless are suffering with the cold blasts of winter, or what would probably be much better, that the thousands in all our cities who are unable to procure a comfortable subsistence, were placed where they could subdue the forest and cultivate the rich soil on which it stands, reaping the blessed reward of competence and contentment which usually attends those engaged in agricultural pursuits.

We have several congregations in the county enjoying about an average degree of prosperity, and making an aggregate membership of about eight hundred. In liberality of sentiment and general intelligence, they will compare favorably with any other class of the citizens. As far as our enterprise is concerned, we found a more hearty response than we had anticipated. We find that the great mass of our brethren in almost every locality have more enterprise, more public spirit, and more liberality than is found in the sectarian world; and we account for it on the principle that the Bible, when unaccompanied with human creeds and disciplines, is calculated to elevate the views and expand the magnanimity of those who make it the rule of their faith and practice.

Passing over several places, we find ourself introduced to the White River Valley, at a point where the Jeffersonville and Columbus Road intersects the one from Cincinnati to St. Louis. A small town has sprung up there called "Seymour," which for its age, is quite a flourishing place. We have but few brethren in the place, although there are enough within meeting distance to form a nucleus if gathered together, which if attended to properly, might be of vast benefit to the citizens, as well as the surrounding country. We think brethren in the country should, in order to build up the cause at important points, make a sacrifice of what they consider their personal convenience, concentrating their influence, rather than get up feeble organizations at their nearest cross-roads. Two miles north is Rockford, composed of two villages known as "Old Town," and "New Town." The latter is a modern looking village of considerable trade, built up since the railroad has been in operation. The former is one of the most desolate looking clusters of what might be mistaken for houses, that can any where be found. It is proverbial for the wickedness of its inhabitants. Its staple commodity is said to be "bad whisky," and it is strongly suspected that its chief branches of industry are the manufacture of *bogus coin* and *counterfeit bank bills.*

We spent a very pleasant night with a long and well tried friend and brother whom we have known for many years, both in adversity and prosperity. We rejoiced to find that no change of circumstances had changed his confidence in Israel's God, or his friendship for those he had any reason to believe were his worshipers. Too many, alas! are unable to stand the glitter of temporal prosperity; like the swine in the forest, they greedily devour the acorns without ever looking up to the trees from whence they have fallen.

On Lord's day morning, brother Hays carried us in his buggy to Redington, one of the oldest and most flourishing congregations in the State. We found many of our old friends and brethren in the Lord with whom we have had many happy seasons in days gone by. It was with feelings of no ordinary emotion that I arose to address the congregation, for I was among those who witnessed my first efforts at preaching the gospel, and who cheered me on in my humble endeavors to persuade sinners to flee from the wrath to come, and trust in the merits of the blood of Christ for pardon and salvation. The spirit of emigration and perhaps some other causes have somewhat abated the former prosperity of the congregation, but it still occupies a high position and must continue to while such men as the brethren "Gilberts," and others of the same sterling integrity remain.

The soil and climate of "Driftwood Bottom" appear to be decidedly unfavorable to the permanent growth of primitive christianity; indeed we have found that, as a general rule, its prosperity is in the *inverse* ratio of the growth of corn and hogs, for both of which it stands unrivaled. In some neighborhoods where ten or fifteen years ago flourishing congregations existed, scarcely a vestige remains. Of those who were formerly warm-hearted christians, full of zeal for the cause, and love for the brethren, we found that many had passed "that bourn from which no traveller returns." Some whole families with whom we have often bowed around the family altar, were entirely broken up, and their members either scattered over the cold world, or sleeping in their humble graves. Some we found who had made a shipwreck of their faith, and who like those spoken of by the Apostle, gave sad evidence that their "end" will be "destruction," "whose God is their appetites, and whose glory is in their shame."

Among those of our former acquaintances who had passed from earth, were those "abounding in wealth," and those who had always abode in "poverty's vale," but now they are, as far as *this* world is concerned, on a perfect equality. Death is the great leveller of the human race. They brought nothing into this world, and they took nothing out. Happy will it be if in the day of eternity they come forth clothed in the robe of righteousness which is obtained by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. My dear reader! we too shall soon be stripped of all that we hold dear here on earth, and if we are not heirs with Christ to that inheritance which is incorruptible and undefiled, we will find that our labor and strife here on earth have been all in vain, and that although we may have succeeded in amassing the riches of this world, still we are miserably poor, and destitute, and naked.

Columbus, the county seat of Bartholomew County, has many advantages, and like most other places, some disadvantages. It is accessible by railroad from four different points, and is surrounded by a very fertile country. It has improved considerably in appearance and size since our residence in it, near twenty years ago, but still it has hardly kept pace with the progress of the age, owing in part to the sickliness of its locality, and perhaps in part to a want of enterprise in its citizens. The congregation there numbers among its members some of the excellent of the earth, but as a church they are, we think, in the "Laodicean" state, and consequently not exerting a very salutary influence on the surrounding community. They have a very good meeting house erected on the ruins of one that was formerly consumed by fire. There are also houses of worship in the place belonging to the Episcopal Methodists, Catholics, Presbyterians, and Missionary Baptists. The last named were holding a protracted meeting at the time of our visit there. We attended some of their meetings, and we confess our faith in the probability of a union with them was greatly shaken. Their preachers, three in number, seemed to know as little about the Bible plan of salvation as the most deluded and ignorant Pædo-Baptists in the land. Their main effort appeared to be to excite the animal passions of their auditory. They relied more upon the death of their parents or children, than they did upon the death of Christ, as a theme by which to affect their hearers. In company with brother Terrell, we dined with them at a house whose host was their brother, and whose hostess was our sister; but they seemed altogether disinclined to any connected religious conversation, and especially so in reference to the *revision movement*, a subject in which we had hoped to find them deeply interested. The great mass of the Baptist members desire to do right, but some of their preachers stand greatly in their way. J. B.

New Year's Present.

MILWAUKIE, Wisconsin,
Third Sunday in Advent, Dec. 14, 1856.

DEAR BROTHER BOGGS:—I attended the Baptist Church this morning, and heard the Rev. W. W. Moore, (Hard Shell,) read off a very orthodox sermon on the resurrection of Christ, from this text: "And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures," 1st Cor., 15, 4. The morning was very stormy, consequently the congregation, as is usual in cities, was very small, numbering all told, some twenty-five souls. Brother Moore read his discourse in very good style, and withal, was rather more dandified than the majority of his clerical brethren that I have had the pleasure of hearing preach. He sported a very genteel gold watch seal, a modest gold breast pin, and used his linen pocket handkerchief in the most approved city style.

In the afternoon I went to the Presbyterian church, (old school,) of course, as that was my mother church, and in which I am still a member in good and regular standing, and heard the Rev. J. M. Buchanan read off another very orthodox discourse in very good style, from this text: "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life," John, 5, 40. The learned brother spoke of God's sovereignty, man's moral impotency, etc., etc. On the whole, his sermon would be pronounced by all true believers in the Calvinistic system as doctrinally sound. The afternoon being less stormy, our congregation numbered about fifty souls.

This evening I went to Young's Hall, and heard Joel Tiffany, of New York City, lecture on Spiritualism. Mr. T. took no text, made no prayers, gave out no hymns, nor did he read any Scriptures, nor did he exhort his auditors to search the Scriptures; he did however, exhort his brethren who believe in the doctrine of modern spiritual manifestations, to repent, and do works meet for repentance. His object in making this flying visit to the West he stated, was to get subscribers to a monthly of ninety-six pages which he is now publishing in New York, that comes at three dollars per annum; he also stated that thus far the subscriptions had not paid the cost of publication. He further stated that the clergy, the church, the press, and the world, are opposed to his favorite system of theology, hence the necessity of the faithful furnishing him with "material aid." From all I could learn, his mission has been thus far rather unsuccessful in raising funds. I was unable to discover from three lectures I heard him deliver, any improvement on the system of theology laid down by Christ and his Apostles, as recorded in the New Testament Scriptures, therefore I refused to contribute to his enterprise. Mr. Tiffany is a very fine speaker, and is not compelled to read off his sermons. I really wished that my Old School Presbyterian, and Hard Shell Baptist brothers, that I heard in the day time, had been present, so that they might have learned the science of addressing public audiences. When will our sermon-reading preachers learn that full half of the good they might do in preaching, is lost by this *old fogy* method. I have yet to hear the first clergyman who habitually reads off his discourses, whose gestures are not stiff, cold, awkward, unnatural, uncouth, and dead. It is, indeed, high time that we should have an improvement or reformation in the department of pulpit oratory.

Having made up my mind to contribute hereafter sparingly to those who preach a pro-slavery gospel, or to a very numerous class of ministers who do not preach an anti-slavery gospel, and believing that you in your Magazine preach the ancient gospel of the regular Apostolical succession; and believing also that, "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel," and subscribing to the teachings of St. James, where he says "What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? can faith save him? If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled, notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body, what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone." Believing then, in a living faith—in a practical gospel—in a practical religion, "Neither will I offer burnt offerings unto the Lord my God of that which doth cost me nothing." Therefore you have, herewith, my check inclosed for this "widow's mite," which you will please accept as a New Year's gift.

With the most sincere respect and christian affection, I subscribe myself your friend and unworthy brother,

JOHN KIRK.

[For the N. W. Ch. Magazine.]

Denominational Names.

DRAKEVILLE, Iowa, Oct. 24th, 1856.

BROTHER BOGGS:—Perhaps a few thoughts and reflections on the subject above indicated, would not be out of place at this time. I shall tax the patience of the reader but a few moments, consequently, I hope to have his earnest and sincere attention. And if, by the simplicity of language, or the forcible plainness of style, I become the means of discovering to a single individual the truth "as it is in Jesus," I shall be amply repaid, and the God of our salvation shall have the glory and honor for evermore.

It is customary in the religious world for a person, discovering what he considers important truths that have been veiled by superstition or ignorance, for generations past, to institute or commence a corresponding form of worship. And, very unfortunately for him and the world at large, in so doing, he takes upon himself a name suited to his fancy, for the purpose, he may say, of distinguishing himself from those worshipping otherwise. This being fairly understood, I shall now venture the following affirmation:

There is *one* scriptural denominational name, and *many* unscriptural ones. Now to be brief, I will ask: Where, in the "covenant of grace," are the disciples of Christ authorized to take the name, Paulite, Cephasite, Baptist, Lutheran, Wesleyan, or Methodist? Shall I answer, *no where?* The spirit of God answers thus, and I can do nought else. 1st Cor. 1st chapter, 12, 13, 14, and 15th verses: "Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul." "We are convicted, and have no answer to give," say they by their actions, no doubt. "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius." Why so, Paul? "Lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name." Why, Paul, what harm would that do? "It would cause *contentions* and *divisions*, as I have plainly shown you," would be his answer in substance. How precisely this explains the cause of the present divided and contentious state of christendom!

But this is not all. In the 3d chapter and 4th verse of the same letter, we read: "For while one saith I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos, are ye not carnal?" Is it not astonishing, that, in the face of this, men do not lay aside their party names, and take the *only* true name, Christian. "But stop," says a good brother; "is not Disciple a scriptural name?" Yes, it is a scriptural term, but it is indefinite of itself, and may be applied to any class of learners, while Christian is a specific term, and will not properly apply to any other, than a follower of Christ.

Now we will hear Peter on the subject: Acts, 4th chap. 10, 11, and 12th verses: "Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ, of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole. This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other; *for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved*." How precise this is! no other name given under heaven, that we may hope to get to a better world in! But notwithstanding this, the writer, when contending for this name, and *no other*, has heard men say, "You are one of those that would go in, and shut all others out, just because they are not of the same denomination." But to such I will just say, that I decline taking the responsibility of barring any person out. But here are the facts in the case: The sheep know the voice of the good Shepherd, and walk in, and *he* bars the *wolves* out.

But now let us view this subject from another angle. It is a time-honored custom for the wife to take the name of her husband; and would it be right for her to do otherwise? All respond *No!* And why? Because the Creator requires it of her, which is the best of reasons. So it is in the case before us. The church is represented as the bride, the Lamb's wife. Is the church a privileged character, that can take any name she may chance to fancy? Surely not. That would be unkind, unchristian. Yea, it would be a gross insult.

But, once more. We will now hear Paul talking to his brethren at Ephesus, when he "desired" them not to "faint" at his tribulations, which was their "glory." "For this cause I bow my knee unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family (of God, be it remembered,) in heaven and earth is named:" Eph. 3d chap. 14, 15. This is the clincher! Paul was giving his few brethren there to understand that the whole family of God were named Christians, in honor to his Son, Christ.

I sincerely hope and pray that this subject may be correctly understood, and when understood, *practised*, that the incubus of division, contention and strife may be removed, and Zion go forth as a bride, *pure*, *peaceable*, and *lovely*.

May the God of the oppressed bless you abundantly with wisdom, that you may "follow peace with all men," in earnestly contending for "the faith once delivered to the saints."

In behalf of the oppressed, and in the hope of eternal life, I remain your brother. H. E. PAGETT.

Resuscitation of the Jerusalem Mission.

It is known to our readers that there is an effort being made on the part of our brethren south of "Mason and Dixon's Line," to get up a missionary excitement for the purpose of sending back to Jerusalem, Dr. Barclay and family as standard bearers of primitive christianity to the semi-barbarous inhabitants of that heaven-forsaken city. The immediate business of those assembled here at the October anniversaries seemed to be to make provision for the return of this mission family. The brotherhood, through many of our periodicals, are informed that ample provision has been made for their hearty co-operation. Bro. Loos, the then Corresponding Secretary, publishes that "every stumbling block has been taken out of the way," and urges for it a general support on the part of the whole brotherhood.

Although we doubt the practicability of the enterprise, we would rejoice if we had any reason to believe that the Society was now made acceptable to the whole brotherhood, and that every stumbling block was taken out of the way, but we have the clearest evidence of the contrary. The brethren in the free States as a general thing, will never, understandingly, give their money to sustain a mission so deeply implicated in the sin of slavery as is the one now contemplated by the A. C. M. Society.

That our readers may have some idea of the feeling in the North, we subjoin the following from the numerous documents we have received protesting against a union with the oppressor in the great work of sending the gospel to the heathen. The first is a copy of a communication sent in response to the "Circular" which was extensively circulated before the Anniversary meeting in October last. The other needs no explanation: J. B.

NORTH BLOOMFIELD, Trumbull Co., O., Oct. 18, 1856.

To C. L. LOOS, JACOB BURNET, and THOMAS J. MULISH:

DEAR BRETHREN:—As a committee, you have been pleased to direct to me one of your circular letters, dated Sept. 29th, 1856, relating to the Anniversary Meetings of the Missionary, Bible, and Publication Societies, about to take place in your city of Cincinnati, and also referring to a proposed "mass meeting." For sufficient reasons, I shall not "be present," notwithstanding you say "we earnestly entreat you" to do so. You say "if you cannot possibly come, at least give us briefly your convictions in writing." I will comply with this reasonable request, or at least, give you *some* of my "convictions."

From "*our periodicals*," as well as from your circular, I learn that it is "proposed" "to concentrate our efforts in one Society;" and your circular, referring to that project, says, "no doubt with us you also feel the necessity of having among us some such *one institution* as a strong bond of union," etc.

Whatever I may think concerning other Missionary Societies "as bonds of union," my settled "convictions" are, that the "American Christian Missionary Society" *never was, never will be, and never ought to be* "a bond of union" among right-minded people.

First—Because, after declaring in its constitution, article 12, that "no person shall receive an appointment from the Executive Board, unless he shall give satisfactory evidence of his christian character and qualifications," it immediately selected as its first missionary, one who was known to have "kept back by fraud the hire of the laborer;"—in other words, a *slave owner*, one, who though professing to love the name of JESUS himself, had raised in his own house a girl to the age of fifteen years without teaching, or causing her to be taught, to read that dear name.

Secondly—Because the Society continued that individual as a missionary after it was known that a part of his outfit was the price of four or five men and women, for whom Christ died.

In conclusion, allow me to express one other "conviction," viz: That it is *folly* for you to try to get the brethren generally *in this latitude* to go into any "union" that requires them to admit that slavery is a *God-ordained institution*. Respectfully yours, for God and liberty.

CHARLES BROWN.

CLEVELAND, January 1st, 1857.

DEAR BROTHER BOGGS:—By the last number of the *N. W. Christian Magazine*, I learn that there is a proposition under consideration to send Dr. BARCLAY on another mission to Jerusalem. To this some object, on account of his having been a slaveholder, and the supposition from that fact, that he is still in favor of that "*sum of all villanies.*" I most cordially concur in the objection against him as a proper person to preach the gospel to the heathen in other countries, unless he first publicly renounces the heathenism of human slavery in our own country. And should he do that—even if he has humanity enough to acknowledge that *every human being* has just as good a right *to life*, *liberty*, *and the pursuit of happiness as he has*, I still think there is a good reason why he should not leave his State for Missionary purposes in any other country. It is not long since a benevolent lady there was sentenced to fine and imprisonment for teaching a portion of the youth to read the Bible, and her daughter only escaped from the same by fleeing to another State. Now so long as such laws are in existence in Virginia, and are enforced too, as to make it a criminal offence to teach reading in the Bible, I think Dr. BARCLAY, or any other person there, who may be a proper person for a missionary to heathen countries, is needed at home about as much as in any section of country on God's earth, Jerusalem not excepted.

I remain as ever yours in the cause Humanity. H. M. ADDISON.

Peace Restored in Noblesville.

To the brethren in Indiana and elsewhere, Be it known, that the middle wall of partition between the brethren in Noblesville, Ind., is broken down, and the two bodies have become one. Praise the Lord!

The undersigned met in Noblesville on the 24th of December, 1856, as a committee mutually chosen, and remained in session seven days and nights, hearing and carefully considering the matters of complaint among the brethren, and are now happy to say that, through the blessing of God, our labors resulted in a reconciliation of the parties, so that the two bodies, before we left, merged into one, and through their respective officers, publicly declared their willingness to forget and forgive the past, and to live and love as brethren.

We would advise our preaching brethren to visit Noblesville, assuring them that they will find there an interesting band of christian brethren.

ELIJAH GOODWIN, *Ch'n.*
JOHN BOGGS,
JOHN YOUNG,
OVID BUTLER,
GEORGE CAMPBELL,
JOHN O'KANE,
BENJ. FRANKLIN.

We have no doubt the foregoing document will be very gratifying news to that portion of our readers who are in any degree acquainted with the circumstances to which it alludes, and for the satisfaction of others, we will add, that the unfortunate difficulty did not originate in any immoralities or outbreaking acts on the part of any of the brethren, but simply a difference of opinion with regard to the scriptural requirements relative to Ordination. Like all other church difficulties that are allowed to remain unsettled for years, it increased until both parties were betrayed into some improprieties. Notwithstanding such an unhappy state of affairs, we were rejoiced to find that almost the whole membership on both sides sustained unblemished moral characters, and, apart from the difficulty, enjoyed the entire confidence of each other.

Although the investigation was prosecuted with open doors, in the presence of a large concourse of anxious spectators, we are of opinion that the whole affair was calculated to *strengthen* rather than weaken their faith in the christian religion. The christian courtesy and moderation which characterized all parties, formed a striking contrast with similar investigations among men of the world.

The closing scene—when they came together with melting hearts and tearful eyes, declaring their heart-felt and mutual acknowledgments and forgiveness, was a spectacle that we have no doubt the angels looked down upon with admiration and delight, and one which will long be remembered by the brethren and citizens of Noblesville, and by every member of the Committee. To us, at least, it was an unusually happy hour, and one, we trust, that will have a salutary influence on all who were present. "How good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

The Power of Truth.

The following letter speaks for itself, and should afford encouragement to every one who desires the triumph of *Truth* and *Righteousness* in our land. We hope it will stimulate the friends of the Magazine to subscribe for duplicate copies to send among their friends and relatives who may be honestly occupying the same unscriptural ground, which the writer of the letter formerly occupied. "Truth is mighty and must ultimately prevail. We believe that the articles under the caption of "Bible Vindicated," by our beloved correspondent, Elder Jonas Hartzell, are well calculated to produce the same result whenever they receive a candid perusal. They should be copied into *all* our religious periodicals, for the enlightenment of their readers. The style in which they are written, is such, as *should not* offend christians in *any* latitude, and if the conductors of our religious journals really wish to disseminate Bible views upon the subject of slavery, they should publish the whole series.

As Bro. Ford's letter is unusually lengthy, we omit some portions of it, not so directly bearing upon the subject.

"**Etna, O.,** January 6th, 1857.

DEAR BRO. BOGGS: I herein send one dollar, for which you will please send me the N. W. Ch. Magazine for one year.

I ask your pardon, Bro. Boggs, and am ashamed and sorry when I think how I have treated you, and I hope God will forgive me, for I did it through ignorance.

You sent me the first two Nos. of the first volume of the Magazine, but I was such an enemy to "abolitionism," that I would not even read a single page in them. At last you sent me the first No. of the third volume, which I threw aside likewise and would not read it. It happened however one day, about two months after you sent it, that I picked it up by chance, and having nothing else to do, I happened to open it and look into it where it was headed "Bible Vindicated," and as I loved the Bible, I thought I would read and see what it said about it. I read the whole article, and my mind was troubled, and I grieved much about it. I began to see that slavery was a sinful thing. I greatly wondered at myself, and I thought: "Can it be possible that I have been reading the Bible for more than sixty years, and never examined it about master and slave?

No, I was raised in a slave State, where professors of religion and every body else held slaves, (except the quakers,) and I thought nothing else than that it was all right. But after reading the piece in the Magazine headed "Bible Vindicated," I could not rest. I felt deeply concerned, for I was convinced I had done wrong. I laid down my bible, and bowed down upon my knees, and prayed to God for the influence of the Holy Spirit. I then took my bible again, and searched through the whole of it, Old and New Testaments, and I am now deeply and thoroughly convinced, and sure, and certain in my heart and mind, that American slavery is one of the most awful and wretchedly wicked national sins that there is under the broad heavens. Yes, Sir, I have searched the whole matter, from "Dan to Beersheba," and am now fully awake to the subject, and I pray to God to waken up all our *preachers* and *editors*, who are standing on the walls of Zion, that they may "cry aloud and spare not;" that they may "raise up their voice like a trumpet," and show to the world, both saint and sinner, the great danger we are in on account of American slavery. It is a most awful and most dreadful national sin. The cries of the poor downtrodden slave have come unto the ears of the great and mighty God, and unless there is a reformation, he will send his fearful judgments upon us. Yes, as sure as there is a just God who reigns in heaven, he will take pity on the poor down-trodden slaves, and send to them a deliverer.

I feel greatly grieved and hurt at a piece I find written in the December No. of the "Millennial Harbinger," wherein Bro. Campbell, after speaking quite respectfully of Bro. Boggs, as a brother for whom he has much esteem, says: "I am indeed not gratified with his one-ideaism, as depicted in his North-Western Christian Magazine, devoted mainly, as I learn, to pure abolitionism. I read a few articles in it, on its first appearance, and laid it on my table, having as full a knowledge of his position as I could ever acquire." He then goes on to say, that "he has not carefully considered Paul's letter to Philemon, which I commend to his special attention. I am very sure that he could not write such a letter to a christian master, touching a runaway slave, as did Paul to Philemon concerning his (*doulos*) slave Onesimus."

Now, I cannot praise Bro. Campbell for what he there says about "pure abolitionism;" for I consider the pure doctrine of the gospel of Jesus Christ *pure abolitionism*. It is to break every yoke and to let the oppressed go free. As to what he says about Paul's letter to Philemon, I feel much grieved at it. I fear it will do very much harm, for it will help the slave-holder to cover up his sins. It brings to my mind what the apostle Peter says about some of Paul's writings, "in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest as they do also the other scriptures to their own destruction." I fear there are thousands who will take what Bro. Campbell has there written as the *end of the argument*, lay aside their bibles and wrest his language to their own destruction.

I know the props, that Bro. Campbell and all others who undertake to justify the slave holder, lean upon. I once leaned upon the same, but I thank God that when I come to examine them, I found them all rotten and worse than nothing.

* * * * * * * * * * *

Notwithstanding I cannot write as I could fifty years ago, you are at liberty to publish this if you think it will do any good. Perhaps it may be the means of inducing others to do as I have done, "Search the Scriptures," and learn the dealings of God with the children of men.

As soon as the weather gets warm, so that I can get out, I intend to go around and get all the subscribers for your Magazine that I can. I want to make as many "abolitionists" as possible, and I pray God to help me, for I believe it to be a good cause, although I used to hate it. I now glory in it, and love the very name "abolitionism."

Yours in the good work,

A. C. Ford.

Queries and Answers.

Bro. Boggs. Sir: I have been thinking for some time of asking you a few questions, and by your leave will proceed to do so.

First: Is it right for a christian to hold office in a political government?

Second: Is it right and honorable for a christian to engage in traffic, such as merchandize, trading in stock, or grain?

Third: Is it right for a christian to sell his grain to distillers, to be converted into whiskey?

Fourth: Is it right for a father to allow his children to have a fiddle to use at their pleasure, or will it be likely to prove beneficial to them in the end?

Onesimus.

Our friend, who styles himself "Onesimus," and who is a very excellent brother, does not see, that in withholding his real name from questions which he expects us to answer *unmasked*, he is imposing upon us a responsibility, which for some reason he does not choose himself to assume. We, however, feel no reluctance to take the responsibility, and will therefore answer as best advised in the premises.

We can see no good reason why a christian should *not* hold any *useful* office, if chosen to do so by the legal voters of his district. To question the right is virtually to deny that christians have a right to vote; for certainly as christians we have no right to assist in placing others in a position that it would be wrong for us to occupy ourselves. While therefore we most heartily condemn the dishonest course taken by many persons, both before and after their election to office, we are of opinion that it is not only the privilege, but the *duty*, of every man, and especially every christian, to serve his fellow men in every way in which he can be beneficial. We believe it would be greatly to the promotion of human happiness if every office in our government was filled by honest, humane, God-fearing *christian* men.

As to buying and selling stock or grain, or engaging in merchandise, we think there can be *no impropriety* in christians engaging in such pursuits, provided the great principles of equity are brought into requisition, and are allowed to govern every action. If a man is honest and governed by the fundamental law of love laid down in the gospel, he will act correctly in his store, or ware house, or wherever he may be; but if he is dishonest and governed by selfishness and unbridled ambition, he would defraud his neighbor no matter where you place him. Some men will act dishonestly even on a farm. They will scant their weight, and measure, and grind down the face of the laborers who cultivate their soil and reap down their harvest. We think as a general rule, "right" and "wrong" is in the *man*, and not in the *vocation*.

In reference to selling grain to a distiller, we answer most unhesitatingly, that in our judgment no christian has a right, (nor if properly informed the disposition,) to do any thing that would aid or abet in the slightest degree the making, vending, or drinking of any intoxicating beverages. To sell grain to a distiller would not only assist in supplying the world with the most pestilential and mischievous commodity with which it has ever been cursed, but it is destroying the provision which God in his abundant mercy and goodness has caused to grow for the sustenance of the human family. Every bushel of grain, that is converted into alcoholic liquors, is so much bread taken from the poor and the destitute, and it cannot be otherwise than wicked in the sight of the Supreme Ruler of the universe.

Whether a "fiddle" can be safely introduced into a family of children, we think depends entirely upon circumstances. If parents allow their children to keep the company of those who engage in singing vulgar and bacchanalian songs, and to frequent places of *dancing* and other kinds of dissipation, we have no doubt but a "fiddle" would be a dangerous article. But if children are brought up in "the nurture and admonition of the Lord;" if they are taught from their infancy to sing the songs of Zion, and attune their voices to the praises of Jehovah; if they are taught to abhor the licentious ribaldry of the age, and every species of dissipation, as they should be by all christian parents; if the family altar is not only made a place of daily resort by them, but so attractive by a judicious blending of reading, teaching prayer and praise, as to make it a source of delight, we think a violin, like any other instrument, might be *safely* and *profitably* used.

One instrument of music is just as *harmless* as an other, in itself considered, and a tune performed on any one is just as pure as the same tune would be if sung by the voice of the most perfect daughter of Eve. If it was right for the sweet singer of Israel to praise God on an instrument of ten strings, we can see no reason why it should be wrong for christians, whether parents or children, to sound forth their thanksgivings and praises in the melodious notes of "Old Hundred," and kindred tunes, on an instrument of *four* strings, even if it should be designated by the unclassic soubriquet "fiddle." The apostle says: "Unto the pure all things are pure; but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving, is nothing pure."

The *good* or the *evil* is not in the instrument, but in the use which is made of it.

J. B.

The Unity of the Human Race.*

1st. Moses, in the book of Genesis, aims evidently to unfold the origin of all things, and especially the origin of man. No bones of a previous race of men could be found, and Moses declares that before Adam was formed, there was not a man to till the ground. He records the history of God's creating, and peopling the sea and the land, and declares that these creatures were made each after his kind. But in the case of man he speaks of a unit. No separate types of humanity are before the mind of God. No different species of men are formed each after his kind, but one man and one woman become the parents of mankind.

---

* This Essay, which appeared in the January No. of The Christian Record, is the substance of an address delivered by Prof. John Young, at the N.-W. C. University at Indianapolis. The author has subsequently revised and corrected it for the Magazine.

2nd. On Adam God enstamped the image of himself. If other, and independent races were since formed, they may not have had this image of God upon them, and as Adam was red and we are white, we might find it difficult to assert our claim to being formed at first like God. For denying the type of humanity to others, we might thus forfeit our own.

3d. The entrance of sin proclaims the unity of man. Only one paradise, one fruit, and one fall, meet our notice in Holy Writ. Yet death spread from Adam, and sin too has gone with death wherever humanity has colonized the earth. This one origin of sin is the fundamental position throughout the Old Testament, and in the New Covenant it becomes the natural antagonist of the one salvation of the world through Christ.

4th. The Messiah is frequently represented to us as a brother—he is bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh—it behooved him to be made like to his brethren. If humanity be one, he is truly our kinsman, but if each of the five varieties of man have had a separate origin, then only one-fifth part of mankind could have had any relationship to Jesus the Messiah.

5th. Paul in his address to the Athenians, proclaims the unity of man, and declares that God made of one blood all nations, to dwell upon the face of all the earth. No language could be stronger or more explicit than this.

6th. Upon the understanding that all men descended from Adam, and that all have followed his steps in rebellion against God, salvation is provided for all men. The highest duty of man is to know God and feel after him, if happily they may find him. God will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. The commission of Christ thus required his servants to preach the gospel to every creature.

7th. When this world's history shall terminate, a great multitude that no man can number, of all nations, kindreds, and tongues shall stand before the throne, and without a jar or contest for lineage or priority, they shall worship God forever.

8th. A common language is apt to accompany a common descent. Moses, therefore, declares that the whole earth was at first of one speech, and deduces the varieties in speech from interposition of Divine wisdom to further the spread of the race throughout all the earth.

I think I am justified in saying that any intelligent man who examines these proofs must settle for himself the solemn question of either admitting the unity of mankind, or giving up the Bible as untrue.

The testimony of Divine Revelation upon this point is clear and emphatic, frequently repeated, and mingling itself with the whole record from the first of Genesis to the last of Revelations.

In past times it was not uncommon for scientific men to allege different origins to mankind, for the purpose of discrediting the Bible. This was undoubtedly a plausible and consistent attempt. For surely, if any principle under heaven could be a test of the standing or falling of Bible authority, this position deserves that pre-eminence.

If men have not all descended from a common ancestry, then have Moses and the Apostles testified falsely in this thing. The celebrated naturalist Agassiz has deliberately rejected the unity of man, and a hireling press has spread his fame and judgment upon this case far and wide, and claims that such an authority goes far to decide the question. But most strange of all, this man venerates the Bible and finds his views to agree exactly with Moses and the

Prophets. He claims that the history given by Moses is a history of the origin of only one branch of the human family. The expression, one blood, he thinks is entirely figurative, and meant only to imply that there are points common to all the races.

This course of reasoning, we suppose, does not merit now a refutation, and we may proceed to sum up the argument from physical peculiarities, for and against the unity of man.

In favor of this unity we submit the following considerations:

1st. There is a common type of physical form and structure amid all the national peculiarities of men. No organ is more wonderful and peculiar than the human hand. In complexity of structure, in speed of movement, in strength of stroke and grasp, and in the combination of these with a delicate sense of touch, capable sometimes of recognizing the color of bodies by contact—the hand of man stands unrivaled. This hand is found alike and used alike through all the races of mankind. Instead of this noble instrument, the highest Ourang has only an unshapely paw which treads upon the ground.

2d. The muscles of man's countenance develop the affections of his mind. The gloom of sorrow, the sullenness of anger, and relaxation of laughter, play by turns as with electric speed upon the human face divine. These depend not on color, in pale or red, in swarthy or black; they follow the impulses of mind, and open a window into the soul of man. In animals laughter is wholly wanting, and other affections are expressed much more by motions of the body than by the muscles of the face.

3d. Man is the only animal capable of educing general truth from a survey of particulars, and thus ascending to causes and becoming acquainted with the laws of creation. Animals expect the return of customary occurrences, they employ means adapted to their ends. They remember, and judge, and invent, but their mental acts are particular and disconnected. Man alone, by disregarding the particular, and seeking after the general law, finds the key in his hand that can unlock the mysteries of God's great universe. This grand peculiarity of reasoning leaves animals stationary, and makes man capable of indefinite progression. I need hardly remark that the lowest division of the human family use words for abstract qualities, and gain some glimpses of pure truth.

4th. Man's power of speech elevates him above all the brute creation. In compass of voice, in sweetness of tone, in delicacy of utterance, and nicety of articulation, there is and there can be no competition. The sentence which the parrot utters, and the chattering of the monkey tribe, are far removed from the beauty and variety of human speech. The tongues of men and angels may yet utter glorious harmonies, but the tongues of men and brutes cannot go together through a single strain. In melody of sound and delicacy of ear, if the Ethiopian does not excel, he at least comes not far behind.

5th. Man's moral nature is undoubtedly his great excelling attribute. The sense of right and wrong in man comes not from fear or habit. It germinates spontaneously within the soul. This conscience of man sees its image nowhere amid the tribes of earth or even the stars of heaven, but far through creation it looks to God, and there it finds the type from which it takes its form and movements, and to which alone it owes allegiance. To no creature can a sense of right and wrong be imparted by education. Habit will readily induce a particular line of action in animals, and lead them to fear punishment upon every departure from this course. But there is no evidence that the animal mind has ever been able to comprehend the good and evil of actions. These terms are, however, found in all the languages of the earth. All mankind seem imbued with a disposition to refer the arbitration of this good and evil to a supreme power. All nations have their religions. The Indian adores the Great Spirit, the African has his Fetish, and the Asiatic adores the Grand Lama; but various as the objects of their worship may be they agree in recognizing a divinity and admitting a responsibility to him. In this respect the unity of the race in all ages, in all countries, and in all grades of intelligence, becomes strikingly manifest.

6th. The desire of liberty and personal property is a characteristic of humanity. Since Abel kept sheep, and Cain tilled the ground, property has been claimed. Every plan of community of goods has failed to render itself permanent, because it has partial removed the title from the individual and vested it in the mass. It is well known that where the laws of States refuse utterly to recognize the right of property, in one part of mankind, these laws cannot be practically enforced. The man who is property himself, still speaks of his hat, his coat, his money, his cabin, and feasts his natural desire with a claim which his owner finds it inexpedent to question. The dog becomes attached to man, and forsaking his own species, rejoices in his thraldom. The horse is not made unhappy by being an appendage to a domestic establishment. He feels as dependent on his master as that master can be on him. The canary born in a cage returns to it again, and will not pay the price of freedom. But even amongst the most degraded of men, four generations of servitude has not yet taught them to prefer their lot to the cares and ills of independence. They are often told that physically they are better off than freemen, and they partly believe it. They wear the air of perfect satisfaction, and assure their owners that nothing could induce them to abandon them. But when the fit season arrives, suddenly home, wife, children, master, cabin, all are deserted, dangers are dared, rigor of climate is endured, and all this for liberty. Tell us not then that this sentiment in the human mind is an abstraction, a phantasy, a thing of education. No—no. The education was all against it, but it is a living, moving, acting reality, demanding the skill, and force, and laws of a race, superior in intelligence, to hold it in check, and prevent its realization.

7th. The unity of the human race, sufficiently proved already, is sufficiently demonstrated in the fact that the offspring of all human amalgamations are prolific, but no hybrid animal can perpetuate the type. This argument will bear the strictest scrutiny. The horse and the ass remain the same since the days of Job. Nature has been coaxed and tortured to furnish a family of hybrid mules, but she sternly refuses to perpetuate a mongrel race beyond the first generation. Human amalgamation is no doubt undesirable and contrary to sound policy, but that it is unprolific, no man will risk his good sense by affirming. Interested partizans have alleged that mixed bloods are short lived, but of this there is not a tittle of evidence. Nay, there is positive evidence against this notion, for the mixed blood sells at a high price, but buyers are not so little alive to their own interest as to pay the highest figure for a weak and short-lived creature.

Our argument has thus been cumulative, and the force of the conclusion is measured by the addition of all the facts alleged in the seven particulars mentioned above. These facts when taken together, furnish a strength of evidence that may well set at nought the cavils of objectors, and relieve us from the trouble of answering arguments which are often as unimportant as they are frivolous.

It is assumed that difference of color proves a different origin. Surely it is